

## The Kansas City Journal.

ESTABLISHED 1824.

THE JOURNAL COMPANY, Publishers,  
NINTH AND GRAND AVES.

**Subscription Rates:** By carrier, per week, 10 cents; per month, 30 cents; per quarter, 90 cents; per half year, \$1.50; per year, \$3.00. Daily only, six months, 50 cents; per year, \$1.00. Tri-weekly Journal (Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday), six months, 50 cents; per year, \$1.00.

**Advertising:** For advertising rates, write to the home office, or to the J. E. Van Doren Special Agency, offices 955-956 Boyce building, Chicago, and 31-32 Tribune building, New York, agent for foreign advertising.

Entered at the postoffice at Kansas City, Missouri, for transmission through the mails, as second class matter.

**During the week ending December 17, the Journal circulated 277,350 copies; daily average, 29,621.**

## Weather Forecast for Monday.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 18.—For Oklahoma and Indian Territory: Threatening weather, with rain in eastern portion; clearing and colder Monday night; wind.

For Missouri: Rain; northeast winds.

For Kansas: Show; north winds.

For Nebraska: Threatening weather and snow; west winds.

For Colorado: Threatening weather; variable winds.

## THE PRESIDENT IN THE SOUTH.

The brief tour of President McKinley in the South will exert a good influence, not only upon the people with whom he came in contact, but upon all Americans. The courageous and patriotic utterances of the president and the manner in which these declarations were received were eloquent manifestations of the national sentiment that has been growing stronger and stronger in recent years.

The most gratifying aspect of the various demonstrations made in honor of the president is the evident acceptance of his profound sincerity. The strifes of politics are apt to obscure the better natures of men and the nobler actions of nations. It is difficult for the head of a great political party, even when he becomes the head of the whole government, to secure full credit for exalted impulse. President McKinley has been singularly fortunate in this respect. He has, from the beginning of his political career, enjoyed the confidence and inspired the regard of political opponents as well as of the popular estimate of his patriotism. There has been nothing to raise a question as to his personal sincerity and official honesty in giving full recognition to the South. The people of Atlanta, of Montgomery and of Savannah have received the president, not as a Republican, not as a Northern, not as a politician, but as an American—an American broad enough to embrace with common fraternalism the whole people, regardless of the past.

Southern comments upon the president's speeches are eloquently reciprocal in fellow feeling. They recognize the boldness and the authority and yet the delicacy of the chief executive's words. Another might have meant as well and yet given the impression of patronizing.

President McKinley has, at various times, shown himself to be a great diplomat, but in this instance—in delivering a delicate and patriotic message to a sensitive people—he owes his great success to his goodness of heart rather than to his skill in diplomacy.

## ENGLAND AND THE CANAL.

In his message to Congress President McKinley declared in relation to the Nicaragua canal that "our policy more imperatively than ever calls for the control of this canal by our country," and this is assumed in English circles to mean that without further aid the Americans intend to appropriate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Mr. Henry Norman, the London correspondent, says: "To those who understand the question the president's words came as a thunderbolt. It is possible that the full text of the message will show that English feelings are without foundation, but as I said it simply places the president in the position of deliberately ignoring the solemn treaty engagement. Public comments have been perfectly dignified and friendly, but a strong feeling is nevertheless underlying them."

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty was made in 1850, and it dealt with the building of a canal across the Central American isthmus. Its terms are strong enough and binding enough, so far as that goes, for it provides that "neither party shall ever obtain or itself any exclusive control over any ship canal, or erect or maintain fortifications in its vicinity, or occupy or fortify or colonize or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America," nor will either make use of any protection which either affords or may afford for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America."

There are many other sections besides the one we have quoted, and each bears upon the intended agreement that England and the United States should always have joint control over any canal that might be built, and the whole gist of the treaty is found in the quoted section together with the stipulations under which most Americans consider the treaty abrogated. England was not to break the letter of the agreement, she established colonies and fortifications in the Mosquito coast, and it is the American contention that she thus forfeited any rights or claim of rights that otherwise might have had. The treaty has never been formally annulled, however, and while there has been correspondence about it in desultory way for many years, no satisfactory agreement has been reached by the late departments.

That the English people are disposed to resurrect this old treaty and make trouble for the proposed American canal is not a mere conclusion by any means. The statement by Mr. Norman that Great Britain has taken offense at President McKinley's message is not borne out by the London papers. The London Spectator, in that it said to be an inspired article, takes the position that England, without waiting to be asked by the American people, should abrogate the treaty. "America," says this paper, "will be compelled by its eastern interests to keep a large fleet in the Pacific. The Americans will also need large fleets in the Atlantic. Promptly to obliterate these fleets and concentrate their strength, there must be a canal across the

Isthmus. Now, by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, America cannot exercise complete control over such a canal. The treaty has prevented the making of the canal. No private company can undertake the construction of it without the assistance of some great government. America will not allow Germany or France to dig it, and England will not do the work alone or in conjunction with any other government. Then let us do the sensible thing and allow the Clayton-Bulwer treaty to be abrogated after the usual diplomatic formalities."

In the course of its argument the Spectator speaks very bluntly of the contingencies of possible war: "If we were at war with the United States, and we owned the canal jointly, she could seize it before we could use it to our disadvantage. If England were at war with any other power America would be neutral, and therefore the canal would be neutral. If the canal should be under the control of Nicaragua or Colombia, France or Germany or Russia could seize it in war. But America owing it, such a seizure would be impossible. Therefore, if the canal is ever to be built, America, according to our interests, ought to control it."

In conclusion, the Spectator advises England to take the initiative with a proposal to declare the treaty off before the Americans get around to asking it, "for when they are forced to ask for a thing they sometimes are not polite about it. Let England take this step of her own accord and it will make America a still stronger friend of hers."

Presuming that the Spectator speaks for the English government, and the presumption is a reasonable one, it becomes apparent that Johnny Bull does not propose to make any difficulties over our government building the Nicaragua canal, and that in all probability the Clayton-Bulwer treaty will soon become a reminiscence.

## DEMOCRACY AND THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

Many Democratic journals are just now having spasms over the system of government proposed for our new territory, the islands of Hawaii. Before considering the nature of these attacks it will be profitable to review briefly the main features of the territorial government as recommended by the Hawaiian commission.

The legislature of the territory is to consist of fifteen senators elected for four years, and thirty representatives elected for two years. The qualifications for a senator are that he shall be a male citizen of the United States, 30 years of age, must have resided in the territory three years, and must be the owner in his own right of \$2,000 worth of property or have a yearly income of \$1,000. A representative must be 25 years old and possess property worth \$500 or a yearly income of \$250. Voters for representative are required to be able to speak, read and write the English or Hawaiian language, and those voting for senator must, in addition, possess property valued at \$1,000, or an income of \$500. This bill covering the commissioner's recommendations fixes the status of citizenship in the following paragraph: "All white persons, including Portuguese and persons of African descent, and all persons descended from the Hawaiian race, on either the paternal or maternal side, who were citizens of the republic of Hawaii immediately prior to the transfer of the sovereignty thereof to the United States, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States."

In effect this bill excludes the Chinese and Japanese from citizenship, and establishes both property and educational qualifications as a requisite to the right of franchise; and it is on account of this exclusion and the establishment of these suffrage requirements that the Democratic journals of the United States are having spasms. As an example of what Democratic papers are saying in this regard we quote the following sentences from a recent editorial in the New York World: "The plan proposed for Hawaii is about the most astonishingly un-American thing that our history has yet produced. It is a combination of oligarchy and absolutism. Under it a great part of the population is entirely disfranchised. More important still, it is disfranchised because of 'race'—a thing forbidden by the constitution in any state of the Union. The proposal is therefore that the national government shall do in a territory what the constitution forbids any state to do within its own borders. But the bill not only creates an oligarchy of voters representing a minority of the population, it establishes prescriptive qualifications for suffrage."

In the first place the bill does not prescribe voters from voting on account of race. It merely prohibits certain races from acquiring citizenship, just as the Chinese are now prohibited in the United States, and there is a wide difference between this and the act of denying a citizen the right of suffrage on account of race. The constitution says that no citizen shall be deprived of the right to vote on account of race, but the constitution does not say that men of all races have the right to become citizens.

Aside from the fact that many of the states have in more or less degree established property and educational qualifications to go with the right of voting, and without stopping to argue that the best sentiment of our country is coming to regard those qualifications as highly essential, it may be said that such an objection comes with ill grace from the journals of a party that has been doing its best for thirty years to disfranchise the negroes of the United States. These journals may find under their very noses Southern laws and Southern constitutions which have for their purpose the disfranchisement of large bodies of citizens on account of race, and they need not go to far-off Hawaii to find examples of a voters' oligarchy. No longer ago than last summer a constitutional convention in the state of Louisiana, made up almost entirely of Democratic delegates, adopted a constitution which has for its avowed purpose the disfranchisement of negro voters, and the twists and turns made by this remarkable instrument in order to evade the provisions of the national constitution are sinuous enough to be amazing.

In order to disfranchise the negro this constitution provides both educational and property qualifications for the right of voting, and yet it fixes the conditions so that the poor and ignorant whites may not in any large measure be deprived of suffrage. First, the voter is required to read and write some language, but this is not made absolutely essential, for an illiterate person is allowed to vote if he pays taxes on as much as \$50 worth of property. Considered together these requirements will disfranchise 8,000 negroes and 20,000 whites out of a total voting population of 130,000, and it became necessary to twist the instrument in order to allow these whites to vote.

So the following provision was incorporated: "No male person who was, on January 1, 1870, or at any date prior thereto, entitled to vote under the constitution or statutes of any state in the Union wherein he then resided, and no son or grandson of any such person not less than 21 years of age at the date of the adoption of this constitution, shall be denied the right to register and vote in this state by reason of his failure to possess the educational or property qualifications prescribed by this constitution."

As the negro was not enfranchised in 1870, his son or grandson cannot vote without the required qualifications, whereas this section so nearly admits all of the illiterate whites that not more than 2 per cent of the 30,000 will be deprived of the right of suffrage. It is not necessary to characterize a party which permits and endorses such an outrage as this in one of the states, while making a virtue of its opposition to the disfranchisement of Chinamen in one of the territories.

## "UPSTART CONQUERORS."

In characterizing Americans as "upstart conquerors," Senator Rios, president of the Spanish peace commission, is right in one sense and wrong in another. He is totally in error in the moral implication involved in his term.

Americans as a nation are not conquerors. They have distinguished themselves in a war of independence, in another war to preserve that independence, in a war to preserve the Union, in lesser conflicts of a worthy character, and last of all in a war of humanity. But the nation has never been rightfully subjected to the imputation of seeking territorial aggrandizement through military conquest. Considering what the Spanish nation has lost and the natural disposition under the circumstances to regard American intervention as a deliberate plan to make the corresponding gains, it is not strange that we should be called "upstarts" perhaps. But in reality conquest, even such as resulted from the war with Spain, is not characteristic of the American people.

If the Spanish term used by Senator Rios has the popular significance that its English translation has in England and America, nothing could be farther from the truth than its application to the American motives in the late war. The term, as we understand it, means one suddenly arrived at a position of power by irregular if not illegitimate means, and who is offensively assertive in the exercise of authority.

In the full history of Spanish-American relations, and especially in that part of it covered by the present administration, nothing is clearer than the disinclination of the United States to go to war with Spain. The Cuban question had been an irritating problem for fifty years before it was finally settled by armed intervention. In this long period every means of philanthropic mediation and every resource of courteous diplomacy had been exhausted in behalf of the oppressed people of Cuba. President McKinley, in the negotiations preceding the declaration of war, was directed by wisdom and humanity. If he and the people whom he represented had been upstarts, a score of incidents during the early part of the administration would have served as pretexts for precipitating the crisis, and certainly the blowing up of the Maine would have been regarded as an extreme provocation.

There is no necessity for discussing Rios' unjust charge, so far as the large majority of the American people is concerned, but there are a few, unfortunately, who will applaud the Spaniard's sentiments.

## EDITORIAL NOTES.

Senator Rios is unnecessarily adding to the humiliation of his country by belittling the character of its conquerors.

Colonel Bryan so shaped his military career that nobody will buy his book, "The First Battle," under a wrong impression.

The popularity of the Bergeng nose in the theatrical world is another evidence of the growth of the expansion sentiment.

If those cowardly Chicago aldermen are honest men they will do the fair thing by Mr. Yerkes and give back the retaining fees.

Perhaps those extraordinary things the anti-expansionists are quoting from the constitution were taken from a revised version.

The talk of a British-American alliance is like the talk of universal disarmament. It is pleasing, but there is no use in it but sound.

If we understand Colonel Bryan, the peace treaty ought to be ratified and the Republican party everlastingly blasted for negotiating it.

The more Hon. Arkansas Jones examines the president's message, the more he feels menaced. Mr. Jones is beginning to wear a hunted look.

Esteemed free trade contemporaries are evidently in no hurry to explain how such a vast volume of exports managed to get over that "Chinese wall."

There are two good things about a Republican prosperity party. The people have money to buy with, and they get the worth of their money when they spend it.

fetching quality of medicine is not impaired by the fact that it is taken straight.

Some of our British cousins are taking the view that it would be better for the United States to build the Nicaragua canal unaided. The same view is held by several persons in this country. Moreover, it is likely to be insisted on.

Governor Leedy will not be so embarrassed by the general condemnation of his special session call as might be imagined. Governor Leedy has become so accustomed to popular condemnation of his blundering official acts that he rather expects it as a matter of course.

According to a Southampton dispatch, public sentiment in England is decidedly unfriendly to the United States, the impression given out by the newspapers and public speeches being erroneous. It is sufficient to say that a public sentiment which does not influence the newspapers and orators is not worth taking into consideration.

## MISSOURI POINTS.

"There is a lesson in it for Columbia," sorrowfully remarks the Herald, as, reciting the three defeats of a similar proposition in "Missouri's Athens," it mentions the fact that Macon recently expressed itself in favor of sewer bonds by a vote of 11 to 8.

Every one of Buchanan county's prosecuting attorneys is still alive, and all are yet engaged in the practice of law except a few who are occupying official positions. James Mytton, prosecutor-elect, is the youngest man ever chosen for the place there.

Beyond question the handsomest Christmas number of a Missouri weekly that has ever appeared is the current issue of the St. Louis Mirror, with that of the always beautiful Columbia Herald a good, close second and the Slater Herald easily entitled to a place in the procession. All are gems, typographically and otherwise, and are well worthy of special commendation.

A Northwest Missouri prognosticator figures it out that Congressman Dockery's political itinerary includes a senatorial trip to Washington, after a four years' stop-over in the executive mansion at Jefferson City, but adds in a consolatory way that Republican success in Missouri will compel a radical rearrangement of the schedule and an abandonment of a part if not indeed the whole of the proposed journey.

In the triumph of Bailey "the hopes of another self-constituted leader of the 'plain people' were blasted," records the Maryville Tribune, "and hereafter the magnanimous 'Speaker' Dearmond must do what a majority of the Democrats of congress order him to do. It appears that the Democrats of Missouri are not running the Democratic party of the nation so awfully fast after all."

The banquet to be given December 29, by the members of the Nodaway county bar to Judge Cyrus A. Anthony, the distinguished jurist who will retire next month from the bench in the Fourth district, will be attended by the prominent lawyers of half a dozen neighboring counties, and in the elaborateness of the menu and the display of post-prandial eloquence will, it is prophesied, surpass any previous affair of the kind in Northwest Missouri's experience.

Senator Vest was a Confederate senator and he never has abandoned his Confederate bias, observes the St. Louis Mirror. He remains a "strict constructionist," forgetting that "the letter killeth," forgetting, also, that the purchase of the Louisiana territory, of Alaska, and almost all our annexations have been in dispute of the constitution to which he appeals. Senator Vest is, with all his talents, an "old fogey." This country is a nation. As a nation it can acquire and occupy territory. It has done so in the past. The supreme court, interpreting the constitution, confirms the nation's right. Mayhap Senator Vest knows this, but "springs" his anti-constitutional resolution in the hope of killing off the silver movement into which he went reluctantly because if he hadn't done so others in his state would have done so and unseated him. The flag will not come down for Mr. Vest nor any more than it did between '61 and '65.

Among the curios which attracted much attention at a recent display in Maryville was a big six-shooter. Back of this gun is a history that is as interesting as the most thrilling yellow back novel. At the commencement of the civil war it was the property of Jesse James. During a raid in the neighborhood of Independence, Mo., Quantrell and his gang of followers became very hard pressed. They were fighting for their lives on the run, when a member of the party, who now lives in Maryville, but whose name, the Tribune says, is withheld out of deference to his wishes, had his pistol shot from his hand. He was riding by the side of Jesse James, then only a common member of Quantrell's band, when the gun dropped, and with it a part of the thumb that held it. Jesse, seeing the accident, reached into one of the scabbards in his own belt, pulled forth a pistol, and handed it to his companion, who kept it until a few years ago, when he sold it to W. F. Smith. The gun had thirty-eight notches on it when Jesse gave it away, and before the war closed the man who succeeded to its ownership added five more, making forty-three—which means, of course, that forty-three men have been killed with it. The old pistol is rusty, but it looks like it might do good service yet in the hands of the right man.

Lifting the curtain which hangs between us and that halloved period, let us take a glimpse, "reminisces" E. W. Stephens in the Columbia Herald, into a Boone county home on Christmas fifty years ago. It is Christmas eve. The earth is wrapped in its liveliest of snow, reflecting a brightness beneath as vivid as that which is shed by moon and stars above. The wind sighs a melancholy refrain, and the leafless trees creak and moan in the bitter December night. The negro slaves are holding high carnival in the cabin to the banjo and the fiddle, while the cabin almost sways beneath the double shuffle and the jig. The negro has known no such happiness in his days of freedom. He now is free from slavery. He was then free from care. The home is of loss weather-boarded, the rooms spacious, the furniture simple. A broad fireplace with a huge black log is pouring a wealth of warmth into the room, while the teakettle sings its merry song above the flame. The trusty rick and a few portraits adorn the walls. The mother is plying the spinning wheel in the corner, keeping time in cheerful song to the musical rhythm of its hum. The father dozes before the fire, "weaving fancy into fancy," as he watches

the glowing embers, or recalling, mayhap, some sweet or sad memory of the long ago. The children have been tucked away in bed, the baby cradled with its inevitable occupant an essential and pleasing part of the picture. Long years standing, well filled with simple presents, hanging above the hearth, are proof that Santa Claus, having performed his stealthy and loving service, has departed upon his glad mission to some other home. Soon the tall clock is extinguished and the house is wrapped in sleep. With the first hours of the dawn come the first rude disturbance, as a woolly head is thrust in with the first greeting: "Krispus muf, Marcell Jeams; Krispus muf, Miss Mody, and all the other darkies come trooping after. One by one the little cotton heads are lifted, and soon the floor is alive with the patter of little feet, and all is din and chaos. Soon, with noise of drum and fife, and firing of guns and shouting of voices, bedlam reigns supreme. Christmas has come. From neighboring homes come reports of guns, and all the earth is vocal with Christmas joy. There is a present for everyone, not costly, but useful. People know how to make presents then. The old man has his eggplant and doughnuts. The mother alone, then as now, gets her enjoyment from making others happy—the truest Christmas joy of all. The day is one of holiday and revelry. The neighbors meet together, crack jokes and exchange greetings. There is a grand dinner of turkey and venison and quail, and every luxury known. It is a great day, and as the night comes the neighborhood party until the dawn, and thus it goes on day after day and night after night, until Christmas week is over. How, even in old age, we love to revel in these delightful and precious memories. However beaten by life's storms, however seared by its sorrow and its sins, the radiance of such days never ceases to shed its halo over every life. It is a bright oasis to which the hardest nature ever turns in tenderness, and its gentle influence never entirely fails to soften the stoniest heart.

## Personality in Politics.

The reception President McKinley is having in the South is one of the most striking illustrations given of the influence a winning personality has in politics. In his journey southward, Mr. McKinley has not passed through a state without winning an electoral vote. Every one of the cities he will visit are opposed to him politically. If the issues of 1896 were presented again for decision next week it is almost certain that the Franco-American would carry a vote overwhelmingly against the party Mr. McKinley represents. But notwithstanding this fact they are giving him a reception which for heartiness and cordiality could not be surpassed in a strongly Republican state or city.

The explanation cannot be found in the natural tribute of respect a people pays to power and to the man who temporarily wields it. A Democratic president visited the South a few years ago, and while he was present in a certain state there was a noticeable lack of spontaneous enthusiasm. He came, saw and went away again. The impression he made was utterly negative. The real reason for President McKinley's popularity wherever he goes is his personality. This has given him a vastly wider influence and has stood him in crises to better purpose than all other qualities as a statesman. It was Mr. Cleveland's utter lack of this quality which made his administration such a failure and will leave it in history as an interim during which the country waited impatiently for the time to come for him to retire to private life. Had he possessed winning personality, Mr. Cleveland would not today be almost forgotten, and his party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected. Only a few presidents in American history have had this characteristic in a marked degree. Most of them have been men of individuality, but they lacked a winning personality. The presidents who had this quality were Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and McKinley. Washington's personality dominated the first eight years of the government. As long as he was president antagonisms were held in abeyance and party strife was smothered. Jefferson made the same party a wreck on the sea of politics. Mr. McKinley's possession of this quality is shown by the fact that his party is stronger and more united and enthusiastic than it was the day he was elected